

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/053,777
Art Unit: 2157

Docket No: 2000-0056

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. By this amendment claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 11 remain pending, claims 5, 6 and 11 having been amended.

Rejection of Claims 5, 6 and 11

On page 15 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Iwamida and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6075,842 to Engelke et al. ("Engelke"). Applicants submit that amended claims 5 and 11 obviate the rejection. Claim 6 was amended to improve presentation.

Amended claim 5 is directed to a device for use in a network. The device includes, among other things, a processor to decode and display on a display device speech information as text in a form of words upon receipt of speech information from the network, wherein the processor includes a detector that responds to subscriber inputs in a form of at least one DTMF tone to activate and deactivate speech recognition.

On page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Montgomery does not disclose or suggest that "said processor includes a detector that responds to subscriber inputs to activate and deactivate speech recognition." Although the Examiner did not explicitly state that Iwamida also fails to satisfy this deficiency, the Examiner relied on Engelke, at col. 4, lines 57-61, and Fig. 1, item 40, to disclose this feature. Applicants disagree with the Examiner and further confirm, upon close inspection of Iwamida, that Iwamida also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Montgomery.

Engelke at col. 4, lines 57-61, with reference to Fig. 1, discloses:

Separately, a bypass circuit, designated at 40, and controlled by an on/off switch 41, is connected between the input and output telephone jacks 12 and 14 directly and which, when actuated, is capable of bypassing the entire internal components of the device of FIG. 1.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/053,777
Art Unit: 2157

Docket No: 2000-0056

Thus, Engelke discloses a bypass circuit that may be activated by use of an on/off switch to cause all of the internal components of the device of Fig. 1 to be bypassed. However, Engelke fail to disclose or suggest a processor to decode and display on a display device speech information as text in a form of words upon receipt of speech information from a network, wherein the processor includes a detector that responds to subscriber inputs in a form of at least one DTMF tone to activate and deactivate speech recognition.

On page 16 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Montgomery discloses or suggests a detector that comprises a DTMF tone detector and user inputs comprising DTMF tones of a telephone. However, Applicants submit that neither Montgomery nor Engelke disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, a processor to decode and display on a display device speech information as text in a form of words upon receipt of speech information from a network, wherein the processor includes a detector that responds to subscriber inputs in a form of at least one DTMF tone to activate and deactivate speech recognition, as required by claim 5.

Applicants further submit that Iwamida fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Montgomery and Engelke. Therefore, Applicants submit that Montgomery, Iwamida and Engelke fail to disclose or suggest, either separately or in any combination, a processor to decode and display on a display device speech information as text in a form of words upon receipt of speech information from a network, wherein the processor includes a detector that responds to subscriber inputs in a form of at least one DTMF tone to activate and deactivate speech recognition. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 and dependent claim 6 be withdrawn.

Amended claim 11 is directed toward a method of providing automated speech-to-text translation. The method includes, among other things, responding to a command, in a form of at least one DTMF tone, from a subscriber to activate and deactivate speech

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/053,777
Art Unit: 2157

Docket No: 2000-0056

processing. Applicants submit, for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 5, that claim 11 is patentable over Montgomery, Iwamida and Engelke and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 8

On page 6 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Iwamida and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,107,935 to Comerford et al. ("Comerford"). Applicants submit that claims 2 and 8 are patentable, at least in view of their dependence from claims 5 and 11, respectively.

Claim 2 depends from claim 5 and is thus patentable over Montgomery and Iwamida for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 5. Comerford fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Montgomery and Iwamida. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over Montgomery, Iwamida and Comerford and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 depends from claim 11, which has features similar to those of claim 5. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over Montgomery, Iwamida and Comerford for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 2, above. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 4

On page 10 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Iwamida and further in view of Comerford and Published U.S. Patent Application 2002/0161579 to Saindon et al. ("Saindon"). Applicants submit that amended claim 5 obviates the rejection.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/053,777
Art Unit: 2157

Docket No: 2000-0056

Claim 4 depends from amended claim 5, as does claim 2. Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentable over Montgomery, Iwamida and Comerford for at least the reasons presented with respect to claim 2. Saindon fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Montgomery, Iwamida and Comerford. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentable over Montgomery, Iwamida, Comerford, and Saindon and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 17, 2005

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:
Samuel H. Dworetzky
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433